

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_103056
Title of the Manuscript:	ANALYSIS OF THE BUSINESS REVITALIZATION OF VANAME SHRIMP (LITOPENAEUS VANNAMEI) AND MILK FISH CULTIVATION TRADITIONALLY POLICULTURAL BASED ON WATER QUALITY ANALYSIS : Case Study in Muara Kintap Village, Kintap District, Tanah Laut Regency
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

### General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://www.journalajfar.com/index.php/AJFAR/editorial-policy> )

### PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. <b>This manuscript is scientifically interesting and interesting to continue to develop;</b></p> <p>2. <b>There are two alternatives; 1. remain like this with the addition of discussion as conveyed in the manuscript notes; 2. adjusted to the content by eliminating words based on water quality analysis</b></p> <p>3. <b>The abstract does not explain what the method is and there are still sentences that need to be corrected and additional information according to the notes in the manuscript</b></p> <p>4. <b>In general, it is appropriate, but there should be additional discussions on R/C in relation to water quality</b></p> <p>5. <b>Agree</b></p> <p>6. <b>In general, yes, but there should be a reference for R/C analysis in relation to water quality</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	ok	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Hasim</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universitas Negeri Gorontalo, Indonesia</b>